1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	ח
10	ע
11	
12	v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

DANIEL T. ROBERTS,)
Diring integration,	Case No. 2:17-cv-01836-JAD-NJK
Plaintiff(s),	ORDER
v.	(Docket No. 16)
AMERICAN FAMILY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY,	
Defendant(s).	
	,

Pending before the Court is a stipulation to extend various deadlines in the scheduling order by either 14 days, 32 days, or 60 days. Docket No. 16.¹ Requests to extend the deadlines set by the scheduling order must be supported by a showing of good cause. *See, e.g.*, Local Rule 26-4. Good cause exists if the subject deadline "cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension." *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 409 (9th Cir. 2000). The primary reason for the extension sought here is that the parties want and have agreed to more time to prepare rebuttal expert reports. *See* Docket No. 16 at 2. The stipulation fails to explain *why* more time is necessary, however, including why the current deadline cannot be met. The stipulation also asserts that Plaintiff will notice the deposition of an adjustor, which may require interstate travel. *See id.*

¹ The stipulation states that the parties seek a 60-day extension. *Id.* The focus of the stipulation, however, relates to rebuttal experts and the proposed new deadline for rebuttal experts is 14 days after the current deadline. *Id.* at 2. Moreover, the proposed new deadline for the interim status report is 32 days after the current deadline. *Id.*

Problematically, however, the previous stipulation filed more than two months ago referenced the need to conduct that same deposition, Docket No. 14 at 3, and no explanation is provided as to why the deposition could not take place during the intervening months.

Accordingly, the stipulation is **DENIED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: November 28, 2017

NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge